

REVIEWS

Language in Society 32 (2003). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404503002069

LUKAS D. TSITSIPIS. *A linguistic anthropology of praxis and language shift: Arvanítika (Albanian) and Greek in contact*. (Oxford Studies in Language Contact.) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Pp. xi, 163. Hb. \$78.00.

Reviewed by JANE H. HILL
Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
jhill@u.arizona.edu

Tsitsipis's valuable and sophisticated linguistic-anthropological study reports on research conducted over a number of years in two Albanian-speaking communities in southern Greece, Spáta in the district of Attika, and Kiriáki in the district of Biotia. These towns historically spoke Arvanítika, a Tosk dialect of Albanian. Although both communities date at least to the fourteenth century, they contrast sharply in that the first is very close to Athens, while the second is in a mountainous, isolated area. Kiriáki has a younger generation of fluent Arvanítika speakers, but language shift to Greek is advanced in both communities – shaped, according to Tsitsipis, not only by economic changes involving improved transportation and communication, the mechanization of agriculture, and urbanization, which have accelerated since the 1950s, but also by the ideological formations associated with the consolidation of the Greek nation-state, dating from the mid-19th century. The latter process focused symbolically on the exaltation of the heritage of the Greeks, and especially of their language. While adding considerable nuance to our understanding of the situation, Tsitsipis confirms the findings of Eric Hamp (1978:161–62; quoted by Tsitsipis on p. 11) that Arvanítika speakers “unflinchingly and happily accept the axioms that Greek is the oldest culture, Greek literature the first . . . and the Greek language the oldest, the richest . . . the only one with a true grammar.”

The book is a holistic treatment of the language shift. The seven chapters treat its history and political contexts; structural details of changes in Arvanítika and their functional implications; performance in Arvanítika; forms of discourse used by “terminal speakers”; and the role of linguistic ideology in the language shift. Most chapters include extensive illustrative texts drawn from interviews and from Tsitsipis's ethnographic fieldwork.

A theoretical statement opens the volume, outlining Tsitsipis's commitment to emphasis on “pragmatic aspects of discourse, narrative performance, linguistic ideology, and what can be called the sociopolitical sides of the shift” (2). Tsitsipis argues that the Arvanítika communities stand in a relationship of “subordination” to the matrix society; he defines “subordination” as “the ensemble of social con-

ditions in which a social agent is subjected to and, to a certain extent, expressing itself through the decisions of another" (12). That is, we do not encounter among Arvanítika speakers overt opposition to Greek hegemony. However, Tsitsipis points out that Arvanítika has had its place within a system of "heteroglossia" in which the language, expressing interactional warmth and commitment to the community, does in a sense "oppose" Greek, which carries overtones of affectation and distancing. Today, though, this heteroglossia is strained, as "modernization" through Greek, with all its economic and social advantages, has since the 1960s become a viable option for speakers.

In Chap. 3, "On sociolinguistic change," Tsitsipis draws on ethnohistorical and folkloristic materials to sketch the baseline range of genres and characteristic usages in Arvanítika that was characteristic of the end of the 19th century, in a context of "internal heteroglossia" in which speakers could exploit creatively a wide range of context-sensitive ways of speaking. Tsitsipis, looking at three types of change, shows how contact with Greek has eroded many dimensions of this system. In "completed changes," only the Greek or Greek-influenced variant is now available. An example is the fossilization of optative constructions, which survive only in fixed expressions and are elsewhere replaced by Greek-influenced periphrastic forms in a narrowed range of meanings. In "continuous changes," the distribution of the Albanian forms is differentiated along a continuum ranging from fluent to "terminal" speakers. An example is the Albanian gerund, which Tsitsipis explored using a variety of techniques, including translation tasks. He found that reduction in frequency of this form (which has occurred in spite of the presence of a functionally equivalent Greek construction) resulted in a general reduction in the range of stylistic options. "Discontinuous changes" most clearly differentiate fluent from terminal speakers. Among these are terminal-speaker usages in the Albanian concord system, involving case, number, gender, and definiteness, where terminal speakers tend to use invariant forms that blur these "crucial grammatical distinctions" (55). Another tendency that Tsitsipis observed in this system is for terminal speakers to produce wildly variable "agrammatic" forms.

Tsitsipis argues that these changes are driven not so much by the absence of opportunities for terminal speakers to learn conservative forms of Arvanítika as by an ideological system within which local purism hardly exists, "deep" Arvanítika is often said to be unintelligible, and failure to use what might be considered normative forms of that language "indexes the desired effects of hellenization" (63).

Tsitsipis's discussions of structural change are detailed and very carefully researched (although word-by-word interlinear translations of at least some of the examples would have been useful for a reader who, like me, knows neither Greek nor Albanian). The discussions of loss of functional flexibility are measured and interesting. However, his most innovative contributions, where the value of his practice-oriented approach is most clearly seen, are encountered in Chaps. 4 ("Per-

formance and ethnohistory”), 5 (“The contextualization of terminal-speaker discourse and the production of an across-the-border voice: Beyond grammar”), and 6 “The coding of linguistic ideology and Arvanítika language shift.”

The first of these chapters focuses on rhetorical structures (including narrative markers, same-language repetitions, and couplings) in historical narratives by fluent speakers, and the ways in which ideological stances are encoded in these. Of special interest in the chapter is attention to the problem of “audience shrinkage,” “the burden or accommodating more or less ephemeral, unstable, fluid, and novel audiences” (86). Fluent speakers find few opportunities for performance, and when they do, the strategies deployed by their terminal-speaker neighbors often force them into reframings and dysfluencies. Terminal speakers may interrupt at inappropriate times, make distracting jokes, miss the point of narratives, and take off from lexical items that they recognize into lists of related forms, or obscene puns on these items. Fluent speakers are “complicit” with (68), and tolerant of, what Tsitsipis calls “interruptive-metalinguistic” terminal-speaker audience behavior, but it often hinders the “breakthrough into performance” that would permit full development of the narrative resources commanded by the speaker.

Chapter 5 devotes more attention to terminal-speaker discourse. These speakers produce what Tsitsipis calls an “across-the-border voice,” which balances deprecation of Arvanítika (a discourse also produced by fluent speakers) with the necessity to avoid disrupting their relations with their elders through undue rudeness. That is, terminal speakers must negotiate an identity that is suitably hellenized and “modern” yet sufficiently respectful of community solidarity and the role of Arvanítika in accomplishing this. The “across-the-border voice” foregrounds metalinguistic discourses that objectify Arvanítika; Tsitsipis comments that this metalinguistic strategy is valuable in that “it is easier for speakers to play with boundaries if they have already taken a certain distance from the language, that is, if they treat it as not quite their own” (100). Terminal-speaker metalinguistic discourse includes several dimensions – attention to and espousal of “proper” Arvanítika, subversion of these norms through jokes and puns, and constant assertion of a peculiar footing, in Goffman’s sense, that seeks interactional autonomy that borders on incoherence. One peculiar feature of terminal-speaker discourse is the production of what Tsitsipis labels “slim texts.” These are relatively short and simple, and they function primarily to assert the metalinguistic “voice” of the speaker; they are “mentions,” not “usage,” of their content. Tsitsipis illustrates the point in an interaction where an old woman utters a stereotypical Arvanítika formula, a sort of blessing that translates ‘May you have my wish’. This is “a genuine formulaic wish expressed in earnest” (109). The same expression, uttered by a terminal speaker, occurs in an interruption of a conversation between Tsitsipis and an elderly informant. The speaker concludes his interruption, a list of Arvanítika words for food that includes an obscene pun, with the formula. However, here it functions as “slim text,” imitating and objec-

tifying the language. Tsitsipis emphasizes that fluent speakers are “complicit,” accepting and ratifying such slim texts even when they are subversive of community solidarity and traditional authority.

Chapter 6 contributes to current theory on linguistic ideology by emphasizing the complexity of ideological discourse in the Arvanítika communities. Tsitsipis discusses two ways in which linguistic ideology can surface: in “congruent discourse” as opposed to “contradictory discourse.” In the first type, there is no interruption of the “subordination” of Arvanítika speakers to the hellenocentric hegemony. In the second type, we encounter more clearly the function of Arvanítika as a language of solidarity, but interrupted by attention to hegemonic ideology. Tsitsipis illustrates the first type with a historical narrative in which Greek and Arvanítika are carefully distributed in reported speech according to stereotypical understandings of the social location of narrative figures: an army officer speaks Greek; Arvanítika recruits complain among themselves in their language, but speak Greek when addressing the officer. “Contradictory” discourse is illustrated by a text extract in which a speaker “slides” from endorsement of Arvanítika to expression of formulas in which the language is deprecated.

Tsitsipis’s discussions are exceptionally rich theoretically, drawing expertly and innovatively on a wide range of influences to try to develop a precise language for the interpretation of the complex shifting frames of Arvanítika speech. His treatment of contradiction and complexity in Arvanítika discourse, and the role of this in the language shift, is masterful. I would strongly recommend this book, along with Kulick 1995, as an exemplary treatment of the kinds of contradictions often found in communities undergoing language shift, in which speakers can simultaneously endorse and undermine a threatened language. Workers aiming to reverse language shift have been inspired recently by the call of Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer 1998 for “ideological clarification” as a necessary step for a community that contemplates revitalization of a heritage language. Tsitsipis’s book shows how difficult this will be, and how very complex are the ways in which ideology, itself intricate, is imbricated with forms of talk and interaction. At the same time, however, the work is a masterful presentation of the kinds of analytic tools that can help us to undertake the task of “ideological clarification.”

REFERENCES

- Dauenhauer, Nora Marks, and Richard Dauenhauer (1998). Technical, emotional, and ideological issues in reversing language shift: Examples from southeast Alaska. In L. A. Grenoble and L. J. Whaley (eds.), *Endangered languages: Current issues and future prospects*, 57–98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamp, Eric P. (1978). Problems of multilingualism in small linguistic communities. In James E. Alatis (ed.), *International dimensions of bilingual education*, 155–64. Georgetown Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Kulick, Don. (1995). *Language shift and cultural reproduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(Received 26 September 2002)

Language in Society 32 (2003). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404503002070

MAGNUS HUBER, *Ghanaian Pidgin English in its West African context: A socio-historical and structural analysis*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999. Pp. xviii, 318. Hb.

Reviewed by ANDREI A. AVRAM
Department of English, University of Bucharest
Bucharest, str. Pitar Moş 7–11, sector 1
ala@pcnet.pcnet.ro

This book, it must be said from the outset, is a remarkable addition to the literature on pidgin and creole languages. It is particularly important because it investigates the diachrony and synchrony of an English-lexicon contact language on which very little has been previously published, and whose very existence has been called into question by some.

Chap. 1, “Introduction” (1–7), consists of a brief review of the literature on Ghanaian Pidgin English (GhaPE) and a discussion of the nature of the empirical data analyzed, the size of the corpus, and the fieldwork methodology.

Chaps. 2 through 4 approach diachronically the West African Pidgin Englishes (WAPes) and Krio. Thus, chap. 2, “A sociohistorical account of pidgins on the Gold Coast” (9–57), traces the history of African-European contacts on the Lower Guinea Coast, with special emphasis on the Gold Coast. The author exploits an impressive number of primary sources in order to outline the emergence of early European-lexicon contact languages in the area. The languages at issue are varieties of restructured Portuguese and of English. On the basis of the evidence (historical and linguistic) presented, the author argues convincingly that these contact languages were, generally, in very limited use. Huber also appears to suggest (28 and 30) that an earlier Portuguese-based contact language was relexified from Dutch at the end of the 18th century. In light of the arguments presented, this is a possibility; however, the question remains why no linguistic evidence attesting to the existence of such a variety of restructured Dutch on the Gold Coast has ever been produced, to the best of my knowledge.

In chap. 3, “Excursus: The settlement of the Sierra Leone peninsula, 1787–1850” (59–74), Huber traces the emergence of Krio, carefully and in great detail. As is well known, modern WAPes, including GhaPE, are structurally very similar to Krio, from which they are assumed by many to derive historically. The author outlines the settlement of Freetown and of the Sierra Leone peninsula precisely in order to identify the socio-historical circumstances under which Krio emerged. Four main groups of settlers are considered: Original Settlers, Nova Scotians, Jamaican Maroons, and Liberated Africans. On the basis of the social and linguistic ecology that he painstakingly reconstructs, Huber concludes that the Original Settlers cannot have had a major role in the emergence of Krio, and that the Liberated Africans must have adopted the variety spoken by the Freetown Nova Scotians and Maroons.

Chap. 4, “The origin and development of West African Pidgin Englishes: Linguistic data” (75–134), first looks at the linguistic evidence for the origin and development of Krio. The evidence consists of the earliest and latest attestations of a number of diagnostic features (Table 4.1, pp. 78–86). Many features are discussed in some detail (86–105). On the basis of their earliest attestation, features are classified as originating in Krio, independently in Krio and WAPes, or in WAPes. (105–106). Next, the same features – except for all the phonological ones – and their first attestations in Gullah, Jamaican Creole, and Pacific Pidgin Englishes are listed (Table 4.3, 108–114). The fact that Krio features have a much higher rate of attestation than WAPE features in Gullah and/or Jamaican Creole is interpreted as evidence that Krio derives historically from Gullah and/or Jamaican Creole. On the other hand, the occurrence of any feature in Pacific Pidgin Englishes as well separates out worldwide features. The data also demonstrate the existence of a proto-WAPE whose origins are distinct from those of Krio (116–119). Finally, this chapter also investigates the transmission of Krio features to other areas of the West African coast (119–129) and includes a discussion of worldwide features in English-lexicon contact languages (129–134).

Having summarized this very dense chapter, let me add a number of remarks. All the examples from Fernando Póo in Table 4.1 (from Zarco 1938), listed as recorded not later than 1938, date from a somewhat earlier period. As pointed out by Lipski (1992:41), Zarco 1938 was originally published almost 20 years earlier. Moreover, there are other, earlier attestations of some of these features. Thus, the following features (as labeled by Huber) are already attested in the late 1860s (Avram 2001): $v \rightarrow b$, $\delta \rightarrow d$, $\theta \rightarrow t$, \emptyset (“predicative COP”), *fit (to)* V (ABILITY), *no* (PREPOSED NEG), preposed *dem* (DEF ART; DEMONSTRATIVE), *me* ‘I’, *we* ‘us’, NP₁NP₂ ‘NP₁’sNP₂’, *for* (LOC/TEMP PREP), *chop* ‘eat; food; (and metaphorical ext.)’, *sabby* ‘know, understand’, *too much* ‘very, most; plenty, a lot’. As for the following features, they are all recorded in Fernando Póo in 1880 (Avram 2001): *go* (FUT), *done* V (COMPLETIVE), *pass* (COMPARATIVE), *me* ‘my’, *book* ‘written material; knowledge, literacy’, *catch* ‘reach; obtain, get (in trouble), have’, *juju* ‘idol, charm, witchcraft’, *palaver* ‘speech, contention, trouble’, *pikin* ‘child’. Two features, said not to be attested, are actually recorded: *be* (COP equ.), in the late 1860s, and preposed *dem* (PL) in 1880 (Avram 2001). As a matter of fact, these earlier attestations are in support of Huber’s conclusion that “in 1860, Krio was . . . well entrenched” among “Fernando Póo’s indigenous population” (121). Further, many of the first attestations of the features considered in Table 4.3 have since been revised in Baker & Huber 2001 and will not be discussed here. I will be concerned only with the occurrence of some features in Jamaican Creole (if attested still earlier than the revised dates in Baker & Huber 2001) and in Pacific Pidgin Englishes (if said not to be recorded in these varieties).

Consider the first attestations (Avram 2000, 2001) of some Krio features in Jamaican Creole. Thus *make* (CAUSATIVE/IMPERATIVE) is first attested in the early 19th century, not in 1862, and (*s*)*tan like* (COP equ.) ‘resemble, be like’ in 1823,

not in 1877. Next, *unu* ‘you, your (PL)’ and *potapota* ‘mud, swamp’, listed as first attested in 1868, and *chuck* ‘sharp; pierce; thorn; etc.’, (*so*) *te* ‘until; intensifier’, listed as first attested in 1877, are all recorded in 1844. Here again, these earlier attestations are in support of Huber’s analysis because they strengthen his case for the genetic relationship between Krio and Gullah/Jamaican Creole.

Other earlier attestations in Jamaican Creole of features recorded both in Krio and in WAPEs are, I think, of some interest for the historical relationships between Pidgin and Creole Englishes. These include *by and by* ‘soon’ and *fashion* ‘custom, state, manner, way’, in 1831 and by 1808, respectively, not in 1969. Also, Krio and WAPEs *book* ‘written material; knowledge, literacy’ and WAPE *small(-small)* ‘a little, little by little (adv.)’, listed as not attested, are recorded in 1844 and in 1873, respectively, but appear, in all fairness, to have been marginal in Jamaican Creole. Finally, the WAPE feature *for* (LOC/TEMP PREP) occurs in Jamaican Creole not later than 1808, but appears to be marginal as well.

As for Pacific Pidgin Englishes, let me briefly discuss here only two features. First, *no more* ‘merely’ is treated as not attested in these varieties because it is said to occur only in modern Bislama and to be marginal in early Pacific Pidgin Englishes. In fact, it is also found in Solomon Islands Pidgin, and there are several early attestations of it (beside the controversial one mentioned by Huber, 112, n. 63): The first one is from 1871, in Queensland Kanaka English (Avram 2001, 2002). Second, *sweet* ‘tasty, nice; be agreeable, please (v)’ is recorded in Tok Pisin in 1957 (Avram 2002). Incidentally, such examples validate Huber’s prediction (106 and 114) that early attestations that come to light will lead to a reclassification of individual features. I would like to emphasize the fact that they certainly do not alter significantly Huber’s conclusions (114–115).

Chaps. 5 and 6 are concerned with the synchrony of GhaPE. Chap. 5, “The sociolinguistics of Ghanaian Pidgin English” (135–163), examines the sociolinguistic status of GhaPE. Two main varieties of GhaPE are identified: educated GhaPE, acquired and transmitted in secondary and tertiary institutions of education and as an in-group language; and uneducated GhaPE, functioning as a means of communication in highly multilingual urban contexts. The latter is also the focus of a short case study (142–147). Also discussed are the institutionalized varieties used in the army and in the police, and the jargonized “Houseboy Pidgin” (152–154). Particular attention is paid to the uses, functions and values associated with GhaPE, including the implications for educators (154–163).

Chap. 6, “A synchronic-structural description of Ghanaian Pidgin English” (165–252), is a detailed analysis of the phonology (166–176) and syntax (176–252) of the basilectal uneducated variety of GhaPE. Occasional references to mesolectal or acrolectal varieties are also included. The body of empirical data is from the corpus of GhaPE recorded by the author. The description is sometimes backed up by statistical data, as in the analysis of pronoun retention and *we*-dropping in subject and direct object relativization (184) and in cleft sentences (196). The analysis is exceptionally articulate and amply illustrated with exam-

ples. In fact, it is doubtless one of the best synchronic analyses available of an English-based pidgin or creole. I would like, however, to comment on the subchapter on the phonology of GhaPE. Huber writes (171) that only /p, t, k, f, s, ʃ, h/ occur as the first consonant in a CC cluster in onset position. The permissible syllable-initial CC clusters listed by Huber (172) are /pr, pl/, /kr, kl/, /fr, fl/, /tr/, /ʃr/, /sp, st, sk/ and /hj/. Consider, however, examples such as *bring* 'bring', *blaŋkes* 'blankets', *gri* 'agree', *smɔ* 'small', and *slip* 'sleep'. Clearly, /b/ and /g/ may also occur as the first consonant in a CC cluster in the onset, and the list of permissible syllable-initial CC clusters should be supplemented with /br, bl/, /gr/, /sm, sl/. Another problem I would like to raise is the very existence in the basilectal variety of GhaPE of at least some consonant clusters in onset position. By Huber's own account, "consonant clusters are frequently simplified . . . especially towards the basilectal end of the continuum" (172). Since it is precisely the basilectal variety of uneducated GhaPE that is being described (165), two alternative analyses can, I think, be proposed. A first analysis would run as follows. The epenthetic vowel in e.g. [p^əles] 'place' or [sⁱkin] 'skin, body' (174) would be taken as being part of their underlying representation, even though "they are considerably shorter than any other vowels in the same word" and although "the same word may be realized . . . without an epenthetic . . . vowel by the same speaker" (174). On this analysis, /pe.les/ or /si.kin/ are the disyllabic, underlying forms, which are normally realized phonetically with an epenthetic vowel in the basilect. Variants without an epenthetic vowel should be regarded, in my view, as anglicized approximations. Similarly, for e.g., [srenɕʒa] 'stranger' (175), although it competes with [strenɕʒa], the underlying representation /srenɕʒa/ can be posited. That is, [t] is not part of the underlying representation; rather, it is added in anglicized approximations. One last issue is paragoge, which can be analyzed along the same lines. Thus, the paragogic vowel in e.g. [mek^ə] 'make', although much shorter, would be part of the underlying representation /me.ke/, but it is elided in the anglicized variant [mek]. In all these cases, alternative, phonologically more complex anglicized variants also surface because even basilectal speakers are normally exposed to both mesolectal and/or acrolectal varieties and to some English. This analysis assumes that basilectal speakers sometimes "depidginize" their speech rather than having an underlying phonological form close to that of English, the phonetic realization of which they occasionally "pidginize." The second alternative analysis would assume multiple storage of underlying representations. On this view, basilectal speakers store both a basilectal underlying representation and a mesolectal/acrolectal one from which the alternative phonetic realizations are derived.

Chap. 7, "Conclusion" (253–255), summarizes the main findings of the study.

Mention should be made of the four very useful Appendices: "References to Portuguese and "Lingua Franca" as early West African contact languages" (257–265), "Portuguese-derived words in use on the Gold Coast" (266–268), "A chronological list identifying data sources of Table 4.1" (269–270), and "Ghanaian

REVIEWS

Pidgin English texts. 1. Spoken texts 2. Written texts” (271–285). As for the references, let me just note that Lipski 1992 would have been a source of earlier WAPE attestations in Fernando Póo.

The book is beautifully edited and practically free of misprints. It is accompanied – a nice bonus – by a CD that contains many of the examples in chap. 6 and all the samples of spoken GhaPE in Appendix D.

In conclusion, Huber’s book is an impressive achievement, a substantial contribution to the study of West African varieties of restructured English.

REFERENCES

- Avram, A. Andrei (2000). The earliest attestations and the distribution of some diagnostic features in the Atlantic English pidgins and creoles. Ms.
- (2001). The earliest attestations and the distribution of some diagnostic features in the English pidgins and creoles. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 3:75–86.
- (2002). Atlantic, Pacific or world-wide features? On the distribution of some diagnostic features in English-based pidgins and creoles. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the English Department, University of Bucharest, Bucharest, June 6–8, 2002.
- Baker, Philip, & Huber, Magnus (2001). Atlantic, Pacific, and world-wide features in English-lexicon contact languages. *English World-wide* 22:157–208.
- Lipski, John M. (1992). Pidgin English usage in Equatorial Guinea (Fernando Póo). *English World-wide* 13:33–57.
- Zarco, R. P. Mariano de (1938). *Dialecto inglés africano o broken English de la Colonia Española del Golfo de Guinea. Eptome de la gramática seguido del vocabulario español – inglés e inglés – español*. 2nd ed. Turnhout: Proost.

(Received 25 August 2002)

Language in Society 32 (2003). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404503002082

HINSON, GLENN, *Fire in my bones: Transcendence and the Holy Spirit in African American gospel*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 2000, Pp. x + 408. Pb. \$24.95.

Reviewed by CHERYL WHARRY
*Department of Language & Literature, Columbus State University
Columbus, Georgia 31907
wharry_cheryl@colstate.edu*

Glenn Hinson, in *Fire in my bones*, creatively and accurately captures the essence of Holy Spirit influence on belief and experience among members of the “spirit-filled” or “sanctified” African American community. Much ethnographic work tends to highlight researchers’ analytical and supposedly “objective” reports of observed behavior; Hinson, however, takes an ingenious phenomenological approach in which the lived selves of sanctified members are presented through their own INDIVIDUAL voices. To the author’s credit, attempts to “shape” or refine participants’ expressions, observations, analyses, summaries, and so on do not appear in this work. Setting the stage for the prominence given the voices pre-

sented in the text, the author offers a noteworthy critique of traditional ethnographic research:

Ethnography has traditionally avoided encounter with the subjective realm of experience . . . Presuming singularity and idiosyncrasy in the workings of individual consciousness, ethnographers have instead focused their inquiries on the workings of culture. Here they explore expressions said to emerge from experience, probe the structures said to order it, and chart the mental pathways through which it is presumably constituted. Experience itself, however, remains but a reference point, a domain invoked but rarely addressed. (12)

Using a single gospel church service, the author highlights the distinct yet uniform performances of prayer, testimony, preaching, and singing; the thread that binds these performances is the “Spirit,” which when experienced creates knowledge and belief. With the voices of “saints” prominent in every section of the book, Hinson illuminates without apology the ubiquity of the interrelated workings of the Holy Spirit through experience, belief, and knowledge. Experience is the luxurious saint-driven vehicle Hinson provides for readers to explore the world of African-American spirit-filled saints. What makes the ride so smooth is that the vehicle, experience, has been tried and tested, and the drivers, the saints themselves, know the vehicle better than anyone except the manufacturer, the Holy Spirit. Hinson has not tried to replace the drivers, nor has he tried to modify (i.e. improve) the vehicle. Instead, Hinson effectively provides readers with an opportunity to ride along and thereby better comprehend the drivers (saints), the priceless vehicle (experience with the Spirit), and the different places traveled (the different components of the gospel program – scripture reading, prayer, testimony, preaching, etc.). Hinson’s resistance to the tendency to marginalize subjective religious experience and to foreground the researcher’s “objective,” omniscient, authoritative voice is outstanding. Although his important analytical voice is clearly present throughout the book, it is the prominent voice of experience, the voice of saints, that makes this work unique and commendable.

The first four of the nineteen chapters set the foundational stage upon which the gospel program is eloquently performed in the remainder of the book (chaps. 5–19). Chap. 1 “Seeking Understanding,” generally prepares readers for comprehending the program as the author stresses the importance of actually experiencing the power of the Spirit in order to understand it. The subtitle “You got to be in it to feel it” appropriately indicates the basis for comprehending matters and manifestations of the Spirit. In order to understand Spirit matters, the author reports, Spirit-filled believers say that one must be in the Spirit and feel the Spirit. Those who do not understand the manifestations of the Spirit typically seen in gospel programs cannot comprehend because they have not felt the Spirit.

In Chap. 2, Hinson aptly follows with saints’ detailed solution to the apparent mystery of the interdependent relationship of belief, knowledge, and experience. He highlights the preeminence of the supernatural over “culture” as agent for

“experience which grants knowledge, informs belief, invites further experience, confirms belief, provides a frame for knowledge, explains experience. Such are the poetics of faith among sanctified believers” (11–12). In the third chapter “Experiencing the holy: ‘Just like fire shut up in my bones,’” Hinson clearly illustrates the point that saints use “the language of experience” to express belief. But again, supernatural agency is attributed to believers’ experiences, and Hinson notes that saints do not

uncritically interpret experience through the lens of faith. . . . Their faith makes their interpretation MORE critical, for it warns them of the power of emotions and provides tools for distinguishing between experience occasioned from within and from without. . . . Questions of emotion, assessment, and holy encounter lie at the very heart of gospel performance and interpretation. (24)

Chap. 4, “A conversation: ‘You’ve got to open the door,’” reaffirms the point that feeling alone does not constitute belief or knowledge but that faith is foundational; salvation comes by believing, and the feeling comes only after one believes and accepts the Spirit or “opens the door” for the Spirit to take control. “And when He takes control, say the saints, you will KNOW and you will FEEL” (28).

The chapters on the specific components of the gospel program (chaps. 5–19) offer a comprehensive picture of a “Holy Ghost” gospel program. In these chapters, Hinson provides detailed descriptions, dialogues, and analyses of such important components of the gospel program as opening congregational songs, scripture reading, prayer, song, praise, welcome, response, the emcee, the invitation, and the benediction. Additionally, separate chapters are devoted to the discussion of format, purpose (subtitled “The anointing of God breaks the yokes”), false purpose (“We didn’t come for no form or fashion”), and the elevation (“Go slow, rise high, catch on fire, and sit down”). Just as the subtitles of these chapters illuminate the real voices of saints, so do the words within the text.

Chap. 6, which covers scripture reading, contains the only section of the work that needs additional analysis or explanation. Here, the author suggests that no special gift is required for scripture reading, and that devotional leaders can select practically anyone to read scripture because the only requirement tends to be that the saint “read with some measure of clarity and flow” (48). “In essence, the act of reading lacks both style and passion” (49). This lack of passion with scripture reading in the Spirit-filled gospel program comes as a surprise. In a majority of “sanctified” services that I’ve experienced and observed, “readers” selected are the ones who can read “with the anointing.” Typically, this requires that the reader read with passion that is directed or shaped by the Holy Spirit; a passionless reader is viewed as one who is not anointed and is not selected to read. This is an especially important requirement in the preachers’ selection of readers during the sermon delivery. In fact, most preachers tend to have a favorite reader or two. These readers consistently read in a manner that exhibits passion and perfor-

mance skill that are well respected and expected in Spirit-filled African American church services. Perhaps Hinson's observation is restricted to the setting of the specific gospel program highlighted in the text, or it could be that this is one area in which the events of a regular church service, with preaching, differ from the gospel program. This is certainly worth exploring. To his credit, Hinson does pose an important question regarding the passionless scripture reading observed in his study: "Does the act of performance weigh so heavily as to override the stated ideal of respect for the holy text? Our search for an answer may well offer insight into the aesthetics of performance among saints" (49). This question brings to mind an additional question about whether the passion and performance skill that I've observed in scripture reading during the preaching event indicates increased respect and intimate involvement with the scripture, or involvement with the performance aspect of the preaching event. Additional analysis of the scripture-reading component could shed more light on the relationship between sacred text and performance in Spirit-filled performances in general (i.e. gospel programs and preaching).

Hinson's book is a must-read for anyone interested in religious discourse, Black gospel programs, or description and explanation of religious experience within any domain.

(Received 22 August 2002)